1	April 6 drop-dead date with Turner Road that finally
2	had to get set, this very, very large carrier was
3	the last one to move all their stuff on that date.
4	MS. DAILEY: Let me move to Cavalier.
5	Cavalier, you talked about the necessity, I believe
6	it's in Mr. Cole's direct testimony on page 2, you
7	talk about the need for duplicate facilities. Are
8	duplicate facilities taken off line at some point
9	or
10	MR. COLE: Disconnected? Disconnected at
11	some point?
12	MS. DAILEY: Yes.
13	MR. COLE: Yes.
14	MS. DAILEY: Remember, the court reporter
15	can't tell that you're nodding.
16	If a Verizon tandem is rehomed, what
17	period of time are duplicate facilities necessary, I
18	guess, optimally?
19	MR. COLE: As short a period as possible.
20	MS. DAILEY: And what's realistic in
21	Cavalier's view?
22	MR. COLE: In the Turner Road, the letter

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

1	went out for April 6. We were still receiving AT&T
2	traffic in July, four months later. I don't think
3	that's you know, that that's optimal. But
4	and
5	MS. DAILEY: I mean, in Cavalier's view,
6	what's a realistic period of time that it would have
7	to have duplicate facilities in place?
8	MR. COLE: I would think three months at
9	most.
10	MR. LERNER: If under the new contract, if
11	a new tandem is established or an existing tandem is
12	rehomed but you can continue to send traffic to the
13	tandem that you were sending it to before and have
14	Verizon transport it on their side of the network,
15	does the duplicate facilities are they still
16	necessary at all in that instance?
17	MR. COLE: You would since you're
18	addressing a trunk group that's attached to a
19	separate tandem, even though you're going to a POI,
20	referring back to the physical facilities, you're
21	still going to have to add facilities, you're going

to have to add trunking to that end office. So yes,

you have to add facilities.

Now --

MR. LERNER: I'm not sure I follow you.

You've got -- you have a point of interconnection

through tandem A, and that's the only tandem in the

LATA, hypothetically.

MR. COLE: Right.

MR. LERNER: Now they have decided to add tandem B at Gray Road. You can still, under the new agreement, you might still be able to just send your traffic to tandem A and then they route it to tandem B to reach the appropriate end office. What duplicate facility will you need, if any, in that scenario?

MR. COLE: If the scenario includes intermachine trunks between their switching and their doing intertandem trafficking, then you are correct, we wouldn't. If we are going to a point of interconnect and there are physical facilities for them to both tandems and --

MR. LERNER: So in other words, if you were to decide to go directly to tandem B, then you

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC. Nationwide Coverage

1	would have some duplicate facilities possibility.
2	MR. COLE: Sure.
3	MR. LERNER: But you might not that may
4	not be a necessity if they would carry the
5	traffic
6	MR. COLE: Intermachine, right.
7	MS. DAILEY: Who does Cavalier get the
8	duplicate facilities from? Is it its own
9	facilities? Is it leasing it from Verizon or is
10	it from Verizon?
11	MR. COLE: Lease from Verizon.
12	MS. DAILEY: Is that exclusively true?
13	MR. COLE: In the two cases that I'm aware
14	of, that's exclusively true.
15	MS. DAILEY: Verizon, what do you think is
. 16	a reasonable period for cutover from for Cavalier
17	to have to lease duplicate facilities from tandem A
18	to tandem B?
19	MR. ALBERT: Going forward, they don't
20	have to. Again
21	MS. DAILEY: So no period is reasonable.
22	MR. ALBERT: Well, they don't have to

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

1.5

lease duplicate facilities going forward, is what we've been saying. We're talking about cases that occurred under past contract that had a whole different structure for which carrier paid for transport.

The thing that's difficult with this topic of the tandems is the work that's done is a real blur of work that's being done for access services, as well as for local services. And I guess that's where I don't quite understand how much in a local interconnection agreement we've got to have these things that deal with access services.

But when the Turner Road tandem went in, that was purely an access tandem. All of the trunk groups that went to the new Turner Road 76T, that was an access tandem, there was no local traffic, it was all interexchange carriers involved with the new Turner Road switch.

What remained at that point in time on the old Turner Road tandem was the local traffic. But when we're talking -- so when we're talking about, you know, there continued to be traffic coming from

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

the Turner Road tandem, there was, but that was

MR. LERNER: I mean, I've got a question.

If Cavalier has traffic that they're sending you and some of it is local traffic from their customers here and other traffic is from other parts of Virginia, from their customers on their network there that they bring in to this area and then want to send to you, do they have to segregate what is access and what is local and send the local to D.C. and the access to Turner Road?

MR. ALBERT: The --

MR. LERNER: Or Gray Road, excuse me.

MR. ALBERT: The trunk group arrangements we've got with all other carriers, there will be separate trunk group, and correct me, Pete, if I get this wrong, but a separate trunk group for the IXC traffic for when a CLEC would want to interconnect with all the other IXCs, they have one trunk group that carries that, an access toll connecting trunk.

Then there's a different trunk group that carries the local and the intraLATA toll. What

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

traverses over that would be local calls to like independents, local calls to other CLECs. So there is that configuration and split of the types of trunk groups that we use in our interconnection arrangements.

MR. D'AMICO: And the access tariffs, either interstate or intrastate, would govern either the inter/intraLATA access traffic and the local traffic would be governed by the reciprocal compensation rate.

MR. LERNER: Right. I understand which rate would apply. But let's say they have a customer in Richmond who makes a call to Arlington that's an interLATA call, so it's access. I don't know how Cavalier has their network set up, so this may be totally hypothetical.

But let's say they can route that traffic without using any other IXC, they can just connect it from Richmond to their own network in the Washington metropolitan area. They have to send that access call to somewhere else than they're sending the local call?

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

MR. ALBERT: If Cavalier on their network is carrying a long-distance call from Richmond up to Arlington, they would not route that call to us at all down in Richmond. That would be originating on their network. When they had that long-distance call to deliver to us, they would deliver it on an IXC trunk group that was coming into Arlington. And then we would terminate it to whoever the end user is.

The end user of that call went to -- it might be to another CLEC that was hooked up to our tandem, it might be to a Verizon end user, it might be to a wireless customer.

I mean, I guess the biggest dilemma that we have with what Cavalier has proposed is it would require us, Verizon, to pay the costs associated with the new tandem going in not only for CLECs but also for IXCs and also for wireless customers. And we just -- we've never done that. I mean, everybody --

MS. DAILEY: Well, I mean, this is a contract between Verizon and Cavalier. You're

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

arquing that this would set an unfortunate 1 precedent; correct? 2 3 MR. ALBERT: For wireless and IXCs, plus it could be MFNs in Virginia, I'm assuming, by other 4 5 CLECs. 6 MS. DAILEY: Understood. 7 MR. CLIFT: I would like to clarify. 8 contract proposal really leaves the IXC world alone, it doesn't touch it. So I would disagree with 9 Mr. Albert's characterization of that. It's only 10 11 for the delivery of Cavalier's local exchange 12 traffic pursuant to an interconnection arrangement. In the access arena, interexchange 13 carriers would still purchase access today at tandem 14 15 A and purchase access again at tandem B. We're talking about the delivery of our own local exchange 16 17 traffic from tandem A to tandem B. 18 So I think for ease of discussion, the IXC 19 side of the world is unaffected. MS. DAILEY: So the IXC side of the world, 20 21 which I believe Verizon is trying to distinguish,

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

does not concern Cavalier; is that correct?

MR. CLIFT: That's correct.

MS. DAILEY: If you can give me the kindergarten version, explain to me, Cavalier, why you would not keep these duplicate facilities in place after the tandem is rehomed. Let me explain my -- let me -- that's the question. Let me explain my understanding.

If a tandem is rehomed, some of the traffic still has to go to the old tandem; correct?

MR. COLE: No.

MS. DAILEY: No, okay. Can you explain -- can you explain to me where I'm confused?

MR. COLE: Based on the LERG, local exchange routing guide, that the traffic would be homed to a given -- let's say in the case of Turner in Richmond, they actually put an access -- we would take the access traffic and route it to that tandem. The reason we would keep the duplicate facilities was during the period of transition, not all the traffic would be moved, so you have periods where you still need to get to the access portion of the original tandem, until the split and all traffic was

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

moved.

Once that traffic is moved to that new tandem, then you don't need those duplicate facilities. Now, granted you're going to have traffic, in this case local traffic, that's going to continue in interLATA toll that's going to continue to that original tandem in Richmond's case, and you keep those facilities, but you won't need as many, and you won't -- they won't be characterized the same.

MS. DAILEY: The language that Cavalier has proposed does not just, as Mr. Albert points out, cover tandem rehomings; it covers network rearrangements. Can you tell me what Cavalier means by "network rearrangements," other than tandem rehomings?

MR. COLE: Specifically, when we're involved in moving traffic and there's a cost to do that and we make changes and add facilities to do that, whether it's capacity or otherwise, if there's a delay in that occurring, then there's a cost and there may be, and this happens occasionally, we may

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

have a situation where we have to have engineers go			
in and make changes and then redo those changes,			
based on the delay. I think that's what we're			
talking about.			

MR. CLIFT: But typical network
maintenance of additional capacities and additional
trunking is not -- with traffic being handed off
pretty much the same but all we're doing is adding
capacities to that would be unaffected, what we're
talking about specifically in our contract proposed
is where there is a physical change, where traffic
has to be rearranged and moved, and the tandem
example was probably the most prevalent example. As
Mr. Albert told us about the expectations for the
future. But that's really the predominant case that
this would apply to.

MS. DAILEY: Is Cavalier familiar with the FCC's network change notification rules?

MR. CLIFT: Yes.

MS. DAILEY: Does Cavalier contend that Verizon hasn't been complying with these rules in connection with tandem rehoming?

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

1 MR. CLIFT: We aren't making that 2 contention. MR. LERNER: You are not? 3 MR. CLIFT: 4 No. 5 MS. DAILEY: Does Cavalier incur more 6 expenses associated with tandem rehoming than any 7 other typical CLEC would? Is Cavalier uniquely situated in any way? 8 MR. CLIFT: I would say -- I don't know if 10 he wants to answer that or not. The same principle 11 would apply to other CLECs as well. I mean, certainly Cavalier has a different architecture and 12 a different way it interconnects with Verizon 13 vis-a-vis what other CLECs may or may not do. But 14 as Mr. Albert recognized, Comcast had a particular 15 issue with a tandem rehoming in Northern Virginia. 16 17 I mean, so other CLECs are affected in different 18 types of degrees. If I may, a facilities-based 19 MR. COLE: carrier, CLEC, may have a -- there's cost elements 20 involved there that -- I'm not a financial guy, but 21 22 there's cost elements involved in having that

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

physical network that are a value of network relationship that a nonfacilities-based CLEC would not have. I don't think --

MR. CLIFT: What Mr. Cole is saying, if a nonfacilities-based CLEC purchased transport to tandem A, then that carrier would purchase transport to tandem B. So perhaps if the aggregate number of trunks they were purchasing was the same, there's no incremental cost. There may be a period of time that there's duplicate transport costs, but there's no incremental cost of -- depending, again, there's mileage and some other things in the formula.

But for all intents and purposes, if they're purchasing 100 trunks to tandem A and 100 trunks to tandem B, then their costs are going to be pretty much the same for that lease facilities.

But as we were talking about here, is that where we are using our own facilities to get to a new point, that's really -- so our costs are really not like the other CLECs'.

MS. DAILEY: Now I'm confused because we talked about the duplicate facilities that you had

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

to lease from Verizon. So you're building your own facilities to point B and you're leasing them temporarily?

MR. COLE: No. From our network point, from our own fiber system, network distribution, we would lease from there to the Verizon tandem. That portion would -- is given costs, our network itself to get to that point is different costs. That was the difference in cost that I was trying to --

MS. SHETLER: I have one question, which is going back to some of Mr. Albert's earlier testimony, just for clarification. Cavalier, I believe, asked you -- you were discussing what they had, if ever -- Verizon and its predecessors in Virginia had paid to independent telephone companies or any other carriers for network rearrangements, and you said that to your knowledge, not a nickel had been paid to any other carrier for Verizon's network rearrangements.

Does that statement include any kind of payments for delays, like you wouldn't pay for them to rearrange the network, but if Verizon, for

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

example, had said things were going -- the cutover was going to start in general and it didn't start until July, or some similar situation, have there ever been any payments for delays to other carriers for their cost to their network due to Verizon's delays?

MR. ALBERT: No, there have not. And let me add to that, though, we've got to be real careful with this term "delays." Because what I was saying is, the tandems not only carry some Verizon traffic, but the tandems also carry traffic for other IXCs, for other CLECs and for other wireless. Verizon doesn't delay with moving Verizon's traffic.

The way a tandem -- a new tandem is cut into the network is, we always move Verizon's traffic first. We move that internally ourselves, because it's efficient, as well as to get the bugs out of the project. We do that right up front in all new tandems.

After that, then there's a period of time where all of the other carriers have to move their traffic. And I think what Cavalier has been

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

referring to as "delays" are really those periods of time that's required for all of these other carriers to move their traffic.

So like as an example, if Cavalier benefits by being able to connect to Comcast, by going through our tandem, if they are unhappy with Comcast not moving their traffic quickly enough, they could alternatively direct -- directly connect to Comcast.

So I guess what bothers me a little bit is it seems to me like Verizon is getting labeled as delaying because we are working to accommodate with all these other 50 carriers per tandem, them getting their traffic moved. And if somebody like AT&T has got certain situations so they have got to wait until the very last day, I don't consider that a Verizon delay. I consider us trying to be customer-focused and that we're working with other carriers because they have problems in the timings of getting their traffic moved.

The only dilemma that presents to other carriers is if they still want to connect and

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

benefit by connecting to that carrier by going through us, then they need to wait for when that other carrier is going to move their stuff. We don't try and pound the hell out of the people that use our tandems. We try to work with them on their schedules when they can move traffic.

MS. SHETLER: What kind of notice is given with regard to the window, and how does it work if carriers let Verizon know -- or what happens, like how does this sequence of carriers moving occur?

MR. ALBERT: Two ways. I think in the discovery, there were a variety of industry letters. We've used that process since divestiture, to let carriers know when we're doing things to tandems.

So there's a letter that goes out to the industry which goes out to all of the carriers that are connected, be it CLEC, be it independents, be it wireless. And that has the general time frames and dates over which activities will occur.

In the process at some point, we will set a final window out in the future, when we expect everybody to have had their traffic moved prior to

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

that point. But then what we do is, working up towards that window, that like drop-dead date that we ask for, working up to that point, carriers are all moving their traffic at different points in time, and as those get scheduled to occur, we then send further project bulletins out to all the other carriers that are hooked up to the switch, to say okay, on this date at midnight, Sprint will now be moving and receiving -- moving their originating or moving their terminating, whichever the case may be, from tandem A to tandem B.

So we'll have a series of letters that will go and spell out specifically when other carriers are moving that works up to the drop-dead date, and we'll have the industry letter, kind of the general one up front, and then we'll have the industry letter that sets the drop-dead date.

MS. SHETLER: There's never -- since

Verizon schedules this, I just want to make sure I

understand, and you do -- once Verizon cuts over

their traffic, it is -- that's sort of the start for

other carriers to move their traffic? Does Verizon

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

ever delay the beginning of that window? Has there ever been a situation where you say, you're going to be cut over, you know, in October, other carriers can start cutting over November 15, but actually other carriers who were prepared to start cutting over at the beginning couldn't cut over until February?

MR. ALBERT: There have been some like that.

MS. SHETLER: Okay. And has -- in that kind of situation, if a carrier was up and prepared to be the first mover, has there ever been -- you're saying there's never been a situation where there's been any kind of compensation for other carriers for the fact that when they were ready to go according to Verizon's schedule -- and Verizon wasn't able to move them?

MR. ALBERT: No, there has not ever been any payment for that. That's usually because when there has been a change in that upfront date, nobody has done anything yet prior to that. So when we have had a change, like in what we're calling that

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

800-336-6646

upfront date, when those have occurred, nobody else has done anything yet to cause a problem for them.

MS. SHETLER: Does Cavalier want to respond to any of this or add anything to the description of how this works?

MR. LERNER: They haven't indicated. Is the silence --

MR. CLIFT: No, I guess the only point that I wanted to clarify, in terms of -- in terms of terminology and definitions and how all this works, is I tried to simplify it really in terms of an interconnection arrangement that we have with Verizon, is that to establish the networks between the two companies, there's paperwork, there's ASRs being submitted, et cetera, et cetera. But in terms of the charges, if our facility -- it really boils down to the facility charge, is the issue here.

We've established duplicate trunking between the two facilities, and we've had that duplicate trunking up for an extended period of time, which we thought was unreasonable. But be that as it may, we're really talking in terms of who

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

1	is paying what for what, it's the additional
2	facility between the two respective tandems.
3	I'm hearing Mr. D'Amico say under the new
4	agreement, we don't have to pay for that facility
5	and he can move the interconnection point and he's
6	responsible for facility for that move.
7	I guess my only comment is that's the
8	first we've ever heard of that.
9	MR. LERNER: Well, I don't think the
10	interconnection point isn't actually moving. The
11	interconnection point, your point as I understood
12	it, is the interconnection point stays where it was
13	and they don't have to change it and you'll just
14	move the traffic on your side of the interconnection

MR. ALBERT: We'll build the additional transport facilities.

point.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. LERNER: As necessary, and you might then intermingle that with other traffic of other carriers, or your own traffic.

MR. ALBERT: It would be pretty much dedicated to each -- the transport facilities that

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

we would build on our side of the point of interconnection down at the DS3 level and below would be those transport facilities, would be dedicated to a specific carrier.

MR. D'AMICO: The term in the contract, I believe, is point of interconnection. I don't believe "interconnection point," as it was previously used, is a term that we now have as a defined term.

MS. NATOLI: So the only thing, then, in that situation that Cavalier would have to coordinate, effectively to accommodate the new -- oh, it wouldn't even have to do any change in the LERG or the routing or anything like that, right, because it would still go to the original trunk, the original tandem, or you would have to?

MR. CLIFT: You have to repoint the traffic.

MS. NATOLI: You would. But that is a standard pretty routine thing that CLECs do. I mean, that isn't a cost -- there's no alleged unreasonable cost associated with that, with having

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

to do that?

MR. CLIFT: No, we're saying there is a cost associated with rehoming, because you've got your -- you're pointing the traffic to two different places for an extended period of time is really what --

MS. NATOLI: No, no, this is the situation where you don't have -- no separate facilities, just they are going to build the trunk group between the two. You still have to do something with your switch, apparently, to make sure the traffic knows that it's going from here to here. That's reprogramming your switch or whatever. But that's not -- that's not one of the costs that's associated with this that you're trying to have recovered in the agreement? Or is it?

MR. COLE: During the point -- during the transition or the implementation of the rehome, we're going to have periods of time -- Richmond is a perfect example -- where Verizon built an access tandem and said okay, this is access, now this is local.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

During that period of time, you've still got to have trunks built to each switch, whether it's in a point of interconnect or if it's direct. MS. NATOLI: You don't mean to each switch; you mean to route the traffic to each switch. MR. COLE: That's correct. You can still have your trunk MS. NATOLI: group to your original point of interconnection tandem, but the traffic that goes over that one trunk group has got -- it's addressed to the new tandem that's being built, and going over the existing trunk groups has got the address to the old It isn't until you're actually converted over that you can then get rid of your old trunk groups, or keep those -- no, because you've already -- the traffic is going over in the new address. I have to set up calls to that MR. COLE: new switch using the signalling.

MS. NATOLI: Okay, I understand now.

MR. COLE: Until I have -- no traffic is

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.